

REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for a first and second tile, wherein one of the tiles includes alignment tabs and the other of the tiles includes alignment grooves. Thus, the claim is reasonably clear that one tile must include a groove and the other tile must include a tab.

The office action suggests that Mazurek teaches alignment tabs and grooves, citing column 3, lines 56-67, and column 4, lines 1-6, and specifically referring to the global black mask. It is indicated that the global black mask provides an alignment grid for alignment. Of course, it does. Referring to Mazurek at column 18, lines 43-48, the grid that is referred to in the background is illustrated in Figure 19 and is made up of stripes 1532 and 1534 of the global black mask 1530. It is seen that all the grid is is a plurality of transverse lines. There are no tabs and there are no grooves on the tiles themselves.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Mazurek is appropriate.

Claim 20 calls for securing a plurality of display tiles to a plurality of first structural plates to form modules.

The final rejection points out that a housing 80 is secured to a rear plate 350. But, of course, there is only one rear plate 350 and there is only one housing 80. There are a plurality of modules 100. However, the claim calls for a plurality of display tiles, that could conceivably correspond to the plurality of modules. But the claim calls for securing a plurality of display tiles to a plurality of first structural plates. There are no plurality of first structural plates that receive the modules 100. Moreover, there is no second structural plate that receives the plurality of modules.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 calls for a plurality of tiles arranged in array with gaps between the tiles. A plurality of the tiles have a regular pattern of surface profile features to find in the surface of the tiles so as to camouflage the appearance of the gaps between adjacent tiles. The office action does not point out what these surface features are. The cited material in the office action apparently relates to Figure 17, which shows no surface features of any kind that camouflage the appearance of the gaps between the displays 430.

Moreover, claim 27 calls for profile features that are V-shaped, claim 28 calls for gaps that are V-shaped, claim 29 calls for surface features that are positioned between adjacent pixels,

and claim 30 calls for surface profiles that are slot-like. Plainly, there are simply no surface profiles of any type in Mazurek, much less the ones described in the dependent claims.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The comments set forth on page 6 are respectfully traversed. The requirement to add more explanation is apparently unsupported and no effort is made to address the material cited at the bottom of page 6 in the previous response.


Further, with respect to new claim 31, which is only rejected based on Section 112, first paragraph, for failing to enable the first structural plate is supported by the item 12 shown, for example, in Figures 6 and 7. The first and second tiles connectable to the plate are supported by the tiles 25, also shown in Figures 6 and 7. The mullions that fit over the gap between the first and second tiles are supported, as shown in Figure 10, by the items 34 that plainly fit in between the tiles 12d. Claim 32 calls for mullions that are T-shaped. Referring to Figures 8 and 9, T-shaped mullions are plainly shown.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

11/7/03



Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]